

## **REMARKS**

### **IN THE DRAWINGS**

Applicants have submitted amended drawings labeling Figures 1 and 2 as prior art.

### **IN THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-24 are in the application. Claims 1, 11 and 19 are independent claims. The remaining claims are dependent claims and depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims. Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 15, 18 and 19. Applicants have canceled claims 5, and 22 in this response. Applicants previously canceled claims 4, 6, 8, 14 and 16. Applicants previously added claims 23 and 24.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 101**

Applicants have amended claim 11 to read that the computer program product is stored in a computer readable storage medium.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103**

Claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 17-21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beom-Seok Lee (Pub. NO.: 2003/0234799 A1) in view of Gregory T. Janky (Patent No.: US 7,050,907). Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's assertions.

Applicants have added the limitation of claim 5, which determines whether a display has multiple sections and gives the user an option to select sections that the user wants, adjusted. This limitation is not mentioned or discussed in Beom-Seok Lee or Janky.

Claims 5, 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Beom-Seok Lee (Pub. No.: US 2003/0234799) in view of Gregory T. Janky (Patent No.: 7,050,907), further in view of Michael Dunn (Patent No.: US 6,890,007). Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's assertions.

The Examiner asserts that the combination of Lee and Janky do not teach determining whether a display has multiple sections and when the display does have

multiple sections or identifying a selected section by a user for adjustment. The Examiner asserts that Dunn teaches determining whether a display has multiple sections and when the display does have multiple sections, identifying a selected section by user for adjustment.

Dunn has predefined display sections. A first portion of an image is in a peripheral vision field of a person. A second portion of the image is at a higher resolution than the first image portion in foveal vision field of the person. In Applicants' invention, the screen sections are not automatically on the screen. Paragraph [0033] and Figure 7, step 75, the user has the option to specify or not to specify sections of the display. Because the user has this option, it is necessary to determine whether a display has multiple sections. In the embodiments of Applicants' present invention, the display sections for adjustment are selected in advance by the user. In Dunn, the section for adjustment are based on a determination of the focus of the user's eyes as determined by the headpiece worn by the user.

In order to sustain a prima facie case of obviousness, there has to be some teaching suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the cited references. Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to present a prima facie case of obviousness. As indicated above, the primary references Lee and Janky, fail to teach the limitation of Applicants' present invention. Lee teaches an approach that makes automatic or continual adjustments of the display screen without considering any circumstances with regard to a user's movement. Dunn fails to provide the deficiencies of Lee and Janky. Lee teaches predetermined screen sections. Applicants' invention leaves this determination to the user. As a result, the present invention has to determine whether a user has specified display screen portions.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings (MPEP 706.02(j)). There is no suggestion or teaching to modify Lee with Janky and or with Dunn to produce Applicant's invention. If there is no teaching, there is no prima facie case for obviousness.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the art of record (alone or in combination) teaches, discloses or even suggests the invention as recited in each of Applicant's claims. Applicant further submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and passage to issuance is respectfully requested. Applicant has canceled two claims and has added two claims. Applicants have also submitted formal drawings with this response. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action dated December 28, 2007, for which the one-month extension date for response is April 28, 2008.

Respectfully Submitted,



Darcell Walker  
Reg. No. 34,945  
P. O. Box 25048  
Houston, Texas 77265  
713-772-1255  
April 28, 2008